

United States District Court, Eastern District of Washington
Magistrate Judge Mary K. Dimke
Richland

USA v. JERROD JUSTIN HALE **Case No. 4:21-CR-6008-SMJ-3**

Video Conference
The Defendant agreed to appear via video conference.

Defendant's Motion to Reopen Detention Hearing: **12/15/2021**

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Pam Howard, Courtroom Deputy [Y] | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Stephanie Van Marter, US Atty (video) |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sean Carter, US Probation / Pretrial Services (tele) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Tim Nguyen, Defense Atty (video) |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Defendant present <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> in custody USM appearing by video from Benton County Jail
<input type="checkbox"/> out of custody | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Interpreter NOT REQUIRED |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Defendant continued detained | <input type="checkbox"/> Defendant not present / failed to appear |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> Additional Conditions of Release imposed |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> 199C Advice of Penalties/Sanctions |

REMARKS

Due to the current COVID-19 public health crisis, all parties including Defendant, appeared by video or teleconference.

Defendant previously waived his right to a detention hearing. The Court will proceed as if this is the initial hearing.

USA proffered the pretrial services report and that Defendant has entered into a plea agreement. USA argued that there are no conditions which will reasonably assure Defendant's appearance as required and/or the safety of the community. USA advises the charges carry a presumption of detention.

Defense counsel argued why there are conditions which justify reconsidering the issues of detention and that such conditions will reasonably assure Defendant's appearance as required.

USA argues Defendant has had other opportunities to engage in treatment and argues Defendant should remain in custody.

The Defendant addressed the Court.

The Court ordered:

1. Defendant's Motion to Reopen Detention is **denied**.
2. The Court ruled that there are no conditions which justify reconsidering the issue of bail or that there are conditions of release which will reasonably assure Defendant's appearance as required.
3. Defendant shall be detained by the U.S. Marshal until further order of the Court.